An Integrated *Optimization + Learning* Approach to Optimal Dynamic Pricing for the Retailer with Multi-type Customers in Smart Grids

Fanlin Meng[a,*], Xiao-Jun Zeng[b], Yan Zhang[c], Chris J. Dent[d], Dunwei Gong[e]

[a]*School of Engineering and Computing Sciences, Durham University, Durham LE11 3LE, UK*
[b]*School of Computer Science, The University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, UK*
[c]*Science and Technology on Ship Integrated Power System Technology Laboratory, Naval University of Engineering, Wuhan 430033, China*
[d]*School of Mathematics, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3FD, UK*
[e]*School of Information and Control Engineering, China University of Mining and Technology, Xuzhou 221116, China*

arXiv:1612.05971v2 [cs.SY] 31 Jan 2017

Abstract

In this paper, we consider a realistic and meaningful scenario in the context of smart grids where an electricity retailer serves three different types of customers, i.e., customers with an optimal home energy management system embedded in their smart meters (C-HEMS), customers with only smart meters (C-SM), and customers without smart meters (C-NONE). The main objective of this paper is to support the retailer to make optimal day-ahead dynamic pricing decisions in such a mixed customer pool. To this end, we propose a two-level decision-making framework where the retailer acting as upper-level agent firstly announces its electricity prices of next 24 hours and customers acting as lower-level agents subsequently schedule their energy usages accordingly. For the lower level problem, we model the price responsiveness of different customers according to their unique characteristics. For the upper level problem, we optimize the dynamic prices for the retailer to maximize its profit subject to realistic market constraints. The above two-level model is tackled by genetic algorithms (GAs) based distributed optimization methods while its feasibility and effectiveness are confirmed via simulation results.

Keywords:
Bilevel Modelling, Genetic Algorithms, Machine Learning, Optimal Dynamic Pricing, Smart Grids

1. Introduction

With the large-scale deployment of smart meters and two-way communication infrastructures, smart pricing based demand response programs are expected to bring great benefits to the whole power system [1] [2].

Most existing research on smart pricing based demand response assume that customers are installed with home energy management systems (HEMS) in their smart meters, i.e. an optimization software which is able to help customers maximize their benefits such as minimizing their payment bills. For instance, references [3–8] propose different HEMS for customers to help them deal with the dynamic pricing signals. Instead of focusing on the single level customer-side optimization problems, references [9–15] deal with how a retailer determines retail electricity prices based on the expected responses of customers where they model the interactions between a retailer and its customers as a Stackelberg game or bilevel optimization problem where HEMS are assumed to have been installed for all customers.

In contrast, [16] [17] investigate the electricity consumption behavior of customers who have installed smart meters without HEMS embedded (C-SM). Even without HEMS installed, these customers can easily get access to price information and their electricity consumption data through smart meters, and are likely to respond to dynamic price signals. On the other hand, with smart meters and two-way communication, the retailer is able to identify each customer's energy consumption patterns based on history smart meter data. For instance, [16] presents a stochastic regression based approach to predict the hourly electricity consumption of each residential customer from historical smart meter data in the context of dynamic pricing. [17] proposes two appliance-level electricity consumption behavior models for each customer in the context of dynamic pricing with the premise that appliance-level electricity consumption data at each hour can be disaggregated from household-level smart meter data using non-intrusive appliance load monitoring (NILM) [18].

In addition to C-HEMS and C-SM, it is also unavoidable that some customers do not have smart meters installed (C-NONE). Therefore, these customers do not have *direct access* to electricity prices [1] and their history consumption, and are more likely to have a relatively low demand elasticity. On the other hand, without smart meters, the retailer does not have accurate consumption data of each individual customer but only

*Corresponding author at: School of Engineering and Computing Sciences, Durham University, Durham LE11 3LE, UK. Tel.: +44 191 334 42469; Email: fanlin.meng@durham.ac.uk.

[1] Although customers of this type could not receive price signals directly due to the unavailability of smart meters, the electricity price information is usually open to the public through other sources (e.g., their retailer's website) and customers of this type might take advantage of this.

the aggregated demand data of all customers. As a result, an aggregated demand model is needed to forecast the total demand of C-NONE. Existing research on aggregated demand modelling in the context of dynamic pricing include artificial intelligence based approaches [19–21] and demand elasticity based approaches [22–25].

Although the above and other unlisted studies have provided valuable insights on how to model customers' demand patterns in the context of dynamic pricing and smart grids, they all consider scenarios where only one single type of customers (i.e., C-HEMS, C-SM, or C-NONE) exist. In contrast, the main objective in this paper is to support the retailer to make best dynamic pricing decisions in such a mixed customer pool that takes all different types of customers (i.e., C-HEMS, C-SM, and C-NONE) into account at the same time. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper to tackle such a realistic and meaningful demand response problem by considering potential responses of different types of customers.

Finally, the main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

• We propose an integrated *optimization+ learning* approach to optimal dynamic pricing for the retailer with a mixed customer pool by considering potential responses of different types of customers.

• A genetic algorithms (GAs) based two-level distributed pricing optimization framework is proposed for the retailer determine optimal electricity prices.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. The system model framework is presented in Section 2. An optimal home energy management system for C-HEMS is given in Section 3 while two appliance-level learning models for C-SM are presented in Section 4. In Section 5, an aggregated demand model for C-NONE is presented. A pricing optimization model for the retailer is provided in Section 6 and GAs based two-level distributed pricing optimization algorithms are presented in Section 7. Numerical results are presented in Section 8. This paper is concluded in Section 9.

2. System Model

In this paper, we consider a practical situation where a retailer serves three different groups of customers (i.e., C-HEMS, C-SM, and C-NONE). The number of above three groups of customers is denoted as N_1, N_2, and N_3 respectively with the total number of customers denoted as $N = N_1 + N_2 + N_3$. The retailer procures electricity from the wholesale market, and then determines optimal retail dynamic prices based on the potential responses (when and how much is the energy consumption) of customers, which can be cast as a two-level decision making framework. The above interactions between the retailer and its customers is further depicted in Figure 1.

As aforementioned, at the customer-side, for C-HEMS, their installed HEMS represents some optimization software such as to minimize customers' bills or maximize their comforts. With the help of two-way communication infrastructure, the retailer is able to know these customers' energy consumption



Figure 1: Two-level pricing optimization framework with the retailer and its customers.

responses to dynamic price signals by interacting with the installed HEMS. For illustration purposes, we formulate the energy management optimisation problem for C-HEMS by modifying [10]. However, other existing HEMS methods such as [8] [7] in the literature should work equally well in this context.

For C-SM, they cannot always find the best energy usage scheduling without the help of HEMS. However, with the help of non-intrusive appliance load monitoring techniques (NILM) [18], hourly or even minutely appliance-level energy consumption data of each appliance can be disaggregated from household-level smart meter data with high accuracy. As a result, appliance-level energy consumption patterns of each C-SM can be identified from history price and consumption data using machine learning algorithms. To this end, we modify [17] to identify appliance-level energy consumption patterns for each C-SM.

For C-NONE, they usually manifest a relatively low demand elasticity due to lack of direct access to real-time price signals. On the other hand, the retailer is unable to know the accurate energy consumption information of each individual C-NONE. As a result, to identify the electricity consumption patterns for the pool of C-NONE, an aggregated demand model is needed. To this end, we modify the approach proposed in [23] to identify the aggregated energy consumption patterns of the whole C-NONE.

At the retailer-side, with the demand modelling for different types of consumers established, the pricing optimization problem for the retailer is formulated so as to maximize its profit. Such a two-level interaction model with hybrid optimization (such as integer programming for C-HEMS) and machine learning problems (such as probabilistic Bayesian learning) at the customer-side and a quadratic programming problem at the retailer-side is non-convex, non-differentiable, and discontinuous. To this end, we propose genetic algorithms (GAs) based solution framework to solve the retailer-side and customer-side problems in a distributed and coordinated manner.

It is worth mentioning that we mainly focus on the pricing optimization problem from the perspective of retailer in this paper. As a result, the benefits of customers are not discussed to depth in this specific study and readers are referred to our pre-

viously published works for more information [10] [17] [23]. Furthermore, it should be noted that the obtained optimal dynamic prices will be applied to all types of customers. A possible extension to the present work is to introduce a differential pricing framework for the retailer to offer different prices to each type of customers. However, how to determine the right pricing strategies for different customers needs furthe research and substantial numerical experiments, which is part of our future work.

3. HEMS Optimization Model for C-HEMS

In this section, we provide the mathematical representation of the optimization model for customers with HEMS. We define $\mathcal{N}_1 = \{1, 2, ..., N_1\}$ as the set of such consumers.

For each customer $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$, we denote the set of all the considered appliances as A_n, interruptible appliances (e.g., electric vehicles) as I_n, non-interruptible appliances (e.g., washing machine) as NI_n, and curtailable appliances (e.g., air conditioners) as C_n. As a result, we have $A_n = I_n \cup NI_n \cup C_n$. Since both interruptible and non-interruptible appliances can be regarded as shiftable appliances, S_n is used to represent such an union set, i.e., $S_n = I_n \cup NI_n$.

We define $\mathcal{H} = \{1, 2, ..., H\}$, where H is the scheduling horizon for appliance operations. Further, let p^h denote the electricity price announced by the retailer at $h \in \mathcal{H}$. For each appliance $a \in A_n$, a scheduling vector of energy consumption over H is denoted as $\mathrm{x}_{n,a} = [x^1_{n,a}, ..., x^h_{n,a}, ..., x^H_{n,a}]$ where $x^h_{n,a} \geq 0$ represents the n-th customer's energy consumption of appliance a at time h.

3.1. Interruptible Appliances

For each interruptible appliance $a \in I_n$, the scheduling window for each appliance a can be set by each customer according to his/her preference and is defined as $\mathcal{H}_{n,a} \triangleq \{\alpha_{n,a}, \alpha_{n,a} + 1, ..., \beta_{n,a}\}$. Note that the operations of these appliances can be discrete, i.e., it is possible to charge the EVs for one hour, then stop charging for one or several hours and then complete the charging after that. It is further assumed that the appliances consume a constant amount of energy (denoted as $x^{rated}_{n,a}$) for each running time period.

Finally, the payment minimization problem of each interruptible appliance is modelled as follows, which can be solved using existing integer linear programming solvers.

$$\min J_{I_n(a)} = \min_{x^h_{n,a}} \sum_{h=\alpha_{n,a}}^{\beta_{n,a}} p^h \times x^h_{n,a} \tag{1}$$

s.t.

$$\sum_{h=\alpha_{n,a}}^{\beta_{n,a}} x^h_{n,a} = E_{n,a}, \tag{2}$$

$$x^h_{n,a} \in \{0, x^{rated}_{n,a}\}, \forall h \in \mathcal{H}_{n,a}. \tag{3}$$

Constraint (2) represents that, for each appliance a, the total energy consumption to accomplish the operations within the scheduling window is fixed, which is denoted as $E_{n,a}$. Constraint (3) represents that appliance a consumes a constant amount of energy for each running time period, i.e., $x^{rated}_{n,a}$.

3.2. Non-interruptible Appliances

For each non-interruptible appliance $a \in NI_n$, the scheduling window is defined as $\mathcal{H}_{n,a} \triangleq \{\alpha_{n,a}, \alpha_{n,a} + 1, ..., \beta_{n,a}\}$. Different from interruptible appliances, the operations of each non-interruptible appliance must be continuous, i.e., once the appliance starts, it must operate continuously till complete its task. Further, the appliances are assumed to consume a constant amount of energy (denoted as $x^{rated}_{n,a}$) for each running time period. The length of operations for each no-interruptible appliance is denoted as $L_{n,a}$.

Finally, the payment minimization problem of each non-interruptible appliance is modelled as follows, which can be solved using existing integer linear programming solvers.

$$\min J_{NI_{n(a)}} = \min_{\delta^h_{n,a}} \sum_{h=\alpha_{n,a}}^{\beta_{n,a}} p^h \times x^{rated}_{n,a} \times \delta^h_{n,a} \tag{4}$$

s.t.

$$\sum_{h=\alpha_{n,a}}^{\beta_{n,a}} \delta^h_{n,a} = L_{n,a}, \tag{5}$$

$$\delta^h_{n,a} \in \{0, 1\}, \forall h \in \mathcal{H}_{n,a}, \tag{6}$$

$$\delta^{\alpha_{n,a}-1}_{n,a} = 0, \tag{7}$$

$$\delta^h_{n,a} - \delta^{h-1}_{n,a} \leq \delta^\tau_{n,a}, \tau = h, ..., h + L_{n,a} - 1; \quad \forall h \in \{\alpha_{n,a}, ..., \beta_{n,a} - L_{n,a} + 1\}. \tag{8}$$

Constraint (5) represents that the total time required to accomplish the operations of each non-interruptible appliance is predetermined and denoted as $L_{n,a}$. (6) indicates that the decision variable is a 0/1 variable representing the on/off operations of the appliance and (7) illustrates that the initial state of the appliance is 'off'. (8) is adopted to guarantee the continuous operations of the appliance.

3.3. Curtailable Appliances

For each curtailable appliance $a \in C_n$, we define its scheduling window as $\mathcal{H}_{n,a} \triangleq \{\alpha_{n,a}, \alpha_{n,a} + 1, ..., \beta_{n,a}\}$. The key characteristics which make curtailable appliances fundamentally different from interruptible and non-interruptible appliances are: 1) their energy demand cannot be postponed or shifted; 2) their energy consumption level can be adjusted.

In view of this, we define the energy consumption at time slot h for each curtailable appliance $x^h_{n,a}$. The minimum acceptable and maximum affordable consumption levels, which can be set in advance according to each individual customer's preferences, are defined as $\underline{u}^h_{n,a}$ and $\overline{u}^h_{n,a}$ respectively.

Finally, the optimization problem of each curtailable appliance is proposed for each customer to minimize his/her payment bill subject to an acceptable total energy consumption,

which can be solved via existing linear programming solvers.

$$\min J_{C_{n(a)}} = \min_{x^h_{n,a}} \sum_{h=\alpha_{n,a}}^{\beta n,a} p^h \times x^h_{n,a} \tag{9}$$

s.t.

$$\underline{u}^h_{n,a} \le x^h_{n,a} \le \overline{u}^h_{n,a}, \tag{10}$$

$$\sum_{h=\alpha_{n,a}}^{\beta n,a} x^h_{n,a} \ge U^{min}_{n,a}. \tag{11}$$

Constraint (10) enforces that the energy consumption at each time slot is within the minimum acceptable consumption level $\underline{u}^h_{n,a}$ and maximum affordable consumption level $\overline{u}^h_{n,a}$. Constraint (11) indicates that for each curtailable appliance, there is a minimum acceptable total energy consumption during the whole operation periods that must be satisfied.

4. Appliance-level Learning Models for C-SM

For each customer $n \in \mathcal{N}_2$, we define the set of shiftable appliances S_n and curtailable appliances C_n.

For notation simplicity, we use s to denote each shiftable appliance and c for each curtailable appliance. Further, subscript n is omitted in the rest of this section.

4.1. Shiftable Appliances

Denote the scheduling window for each shiftable appliance s as $\mathcal{H}_s \triangleq \{a_s, ..., b_s\}$, where a_s is the earliest possible time to switch on the appliance s and b_s is the latest possible time to switch off. Let $T_s = b_s - a_s + 1$ denote the length of the scheduling window for s. Assume the available historical smart data for appliance s are electricity consumption scheduling vectors $\mathrm{x_s(d)} = [x^{a_s}_s(d), x^{a_s+1}_s(d), ..., x^{b_s}_s(d)]$ $(d = 1, 2, ..., D)$, where $x^h_s(d)$ $(h = a_s, a_s + 1, ..., b_s)$ represents the electricity consumption during time slot h by appliance s on day d. Suppose each shiftable appliance runs at a constant power rate, and the total running time and electricity taken for appliance s to accomplish the operations are denoted as L_s and E_s respectively.

Based on the above historical data of a given customer showing when appliance s has been used and the corresponding dynamic prices, the basic idea behind this appliance-level learning model is to calculate the probabilities that appliance s was used at the cheapest, second cheapest,..., or most expensive price. The above insights can be represented as (12).

$$P^s_i(d) = \frac{f_i(d)}{d} \quad d = 1, 2, ...D \tag{12}$$

where $f_i(d)$ represents the number of days when appliance s is used i-th cheapest within the past d days. Note that the superscript s at the right hand side of the equation has been omitted for notation simplicity. Let the current day be d and then $f_i(d)$ and $P^s_i(d)$ can be derived based on historical data up to day d and (12) respectively.

Further, let $\delta_i(d + 1)$ (taking value as 1 or 0) represent the probability that appliance s is used i-th cheapest on day $d + 1$ and then it becomes a new piece of information to be used to obtain $P^s_i(d+1)$. As a result, (12) can be rewritten in a recursive way as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P^s_i(d+1) &= \tfrac{f_i(d+1)}{d+1} \\ &= P^s_i(d) + \tfrac{1}{d+1}[\delta_i(d+1) - P^s_i(d)]. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The above recursive formula shows that when a new piece of information $\delta_i(d + 1)$ is received, the updated probability, $P^s_i(d + 1)$, is equal to the existing probability $P^s_i(d)$ plus an adjusting term. The adjusting term includes the adjusting coefficient $1/(d + 1)$ and the prediction error term $[\delta_i(d + 1) - P^s_i(d)]$. Recall that $\delta_i(d)$ only takes its value as 1 or 0 in (13), which also means the cost (sum of hourly electricity prices) of each possible operation schedule for appliance s is different with each other. However, under some circumstances, many hourly prices are the same within a day and possibly for many days, which could result in two or more operation schedules having the same costs such that there are more than one i-th cheapest operation schedules. To overcome such uncertainties in the price signals, a systematic framework for obtaining $\delta_i(d + 1)$ under different cases is to be given below.

Firstly, suppose that there are in total k possible operation schedules for appliance s and the cost of each schedule (i.e. sum of the hourly prices) on day $d + 1$ is $c_j(d + 1)$ where $j = 1, ..., k$ is an unique index for each schedule. Secondly, $c_j(d + 1)$ is sorted in an ascending order. For the cases where there are two or more schedules having the same cost, these costs are treated as the order they appear in $c_j(d + 1)$ $(j = 1, ..., k)$. As a result, the cost of m-th cheapest schedule can be denoted as $r_m(d + 1)$ $(m = 1, ..., k)$.

Finally, when electricity prices and the usage data of each appliance are received at the end of day $d + 1$, $\delta_i(d + 1)$ is calculated based on the following three cases.

• Case 1. s is not operated as the i-th cheapest schedule on day $d + 1$, then

$$\delta_i(d + 1) = 0;$$

• Case 2. s is operated using the i-th cheapest schedule on day $d + 1$ with the cost $r_i(d + 1)$ which satisfies $r_i(d + 1) \neq r_m(d + 1)$ $(\forall m,\ m \neq i)$, then

$$\delta_i(d + 1) = 1;$$

• Case 3. s is operated using the i-th cheapest schedule on day $d + 1$ with the cost $r_i(d + 1)$ but there are k_0 additional operation schedules where $r_{m_l}(d + 1) = r_i(d + 1)$ $(l = 1, ..., k_0)$, then

$$\delta_i(d + 1) = \frac{P^s_i(d)}{P^s_i(d) + \sum_{l=1}^{k_0} P^s_{m_l}(d)}.$$

Based on the above probabilistic usage model P^s_i, the expected bill of each shiftable appliance s on a given day can be calculated from the perspective of retailer as follows.

$$B_s = \sum_i \left(PC^s_i \times E_s/L_s \times P^s_i \right) \tag{14}$$

where PC^s_i denote the cost of i-th cheapest schedule PT^s_i on that given day.

Furthermore, the expected hourly energy consumption of each shiftable appliance s can be calculated as follows.

$$\overline{y_{s,h}} = \sum_i \left(E_s/L_s \times P_i^s \times I_{i,s}^h\right) \tag{15}$$

where $I_{i,s}^h$ is defined as follows:

$$I_{i,s}^h = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } h \in PT_i^s \\ 0 & \text{if } h \notin PT_i^s \end{cases}.$$

4.2. Curtailable Appliances

The scheduling window of appliance $c \in C_n$ is defined as $\mathcal{H}_c \triangleq \{a_c, ..., b_c\}$. Let $\{y_{c,h}(d), \overline{\mathbf{p}}(d)\} = \{y_{c,h}(d), [p^{a_c}(d), ..., p^{b_c}(d)]\}$, $d = 1, ..., D$ be the available historical input-output data of an unknown demand function, where the input data $\overline{\mathbf{p}} = [p^{a_c}(d), ..., p^{b_c}(d)]$ represent the price signals during the scheduling window $\mathcal{H}_c$ on day d and the output data $y_{c,h}(d)$ represent the energy consumption of appliance c at time slot h on day d.

We use a linear demand function to model how a customer responds to dynamic price signals when using curtailable appliances, which is formulated as follows.

$$\hat{y}_{c,h} = \alpha_{c,h,0} + \beta_{c,h,a_c} p^{a_c} + ... + \beta_{c,h,b_c} p^{b_c} \tag{16}$$

where $\hat{y}_{c,h}$ represents the expected demand of appliance c at time h, p^h is the electricity price at time slot h, $\alpha_{c,h,0}, \beta_{c,h,a_c}, ..., \beta_{c,h,b_c}$ are the parameters to be identified.

In this paper, the least square is adopted to estimate model parameters $\boldsymbol{\beta} = [\alpha_{c,h,0}, \beta_{c,h,a_c}, ..., \beta_{c,h,b_c}]$, where the best estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ are obtained by solving (17).

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\beta}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \ & \textstyle\sum_{d=1}^{D} (y_{c,h}(d) - \alpha_{c,h,0} - \beta_{c,h,a_c} p_{a_c}(d) \\ & -... - \beta_{c,h,b_c} p_{b_c}(d))^2. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Finally, the expected hourly energy consumption of appliance c for a given day, denoted as $\overline{y_{c,h}}$, can be predicted based on the above established demand model. Further, the expected daily bill of c on that day can be represented as $B_c = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}_c} p^h \times \overline{y_{c,h}}$.

5. Aggregated Demand Modelling for C-NONE

In this section, an aggregated demand model is proposed to identify the demand patterns of C-NONE.

Suppose the electricity prices and aggregated consumption data for all C-NONE in last D days are available. We define the electricity price vector on day $d \in \mathcal{D} \triangleq \{1, ..., D\}$ as $\mathbf{p}(d) = \left[p^1(d), ..., p^h(d), ..., p^H(d)\right]$ where $p^h(d)$ represents the price at hour $h \in \mathcal{H}$ on day d. Furthermore, we define the aggregated electricity consumption vector on day $d \in \mathcal{D}$ as $\mathbf{y}(d) = [y_1(d), ..., y_h(d), ..., y_H(d)]$, where $y_h(d)$ represents the aggregated consumption by all C-NONE at hour h.

It is believed that the aggregated electricity demand of C-NONE at hour h not only depends on the price at h but also on prices at other hours due to the cross effect of usage switching [23] [26]. Therefore the aggregated demand model at hour h can be expressed as follows:

$$y_h = R_h(p^1, p^2, ..., p^H). \tag{18}$$

As the mathematical form of $R_h(\cdot)$ is usually unknown, we need to find an estimated demand function $\hat{R}_h(p^1, p^2, ..., p^H)$ that is as close to $R_h(p^1, p^2, ..., p^H)$ as possible. For this purpose, we use a linear demand function to represent $\hat{R}_h(p^1, p^2, ..., p^H)$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_h(p^1, p^2, ..., p^H) = \alpha_h + \beta_{h,1} p^1 + \cdots + \beta_{h,h} p^h \\ + \cdots + \beta_{h,H} p^H. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where $\beta_{h,h}$ is called the self or direct price elasticity of demand, which measures the responsiveness of electricity demand at hour h to changes in the electricity price at h, and is always negative (see (20)). $\beta_{h,l}$ $(h \neq l)$ is the cross-price elasticity, which measures the responsiveness of the demand for the electricity at hour h to changes in price at some other hour $l \neq h$, and is always positive (see (21)). Furthermore, we consider an important necessary and sufficient condition (see (22)) for the electricity to be a demand consistent retail product to ensure that the proposed demand model follows a normal market behavior. That is, when the overall market price is decreased, the overall market demand should increase or remain unchanged.

$$\beta_{h,h} < 0. \tag{20}$$

$$\beta_{h,l} > 0 \text{ if } h \neq l. \tag{21}$$

$$\beta_{h,h} + \sum_{l \in \mathcal{H}, l \neq h} \beta_{h,l} \leq 0 \tag{22}$$

It should be emphasized that the important reasons behind using linear demand models are: 1) As the prices of electricity are normally changing slowly with time, at a given time, we only need to model the demand around a small price interval or locally. Since any non-linear behavior can be approximated well via a linear model locally, it is the main reason that linear demand model is widely used in this research area [22] [27] and selected in this work; 2) with conditions (20) - (22), it ensures the basic market behavior that demands go down when prices go up and vice versa during the pricing optimization. However, nonlinear demand models often fail to maintain this basic market rule and could result in situations such as higher market prices leading to higher usages. As a result, using such nonlinear demand models in the pricing optimization could result in incorrect pricing for the retailer; 3) it enables the market operator or retailers to see the cross effect of usage switching such as customers usually only shift their usages to nearby hours but rarely to far away hours.

Finally, the demand model parameters $\beta_{h,l}, l = 1, ..., H$ can be identified by solving the following optimization problem.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \ & \textstyle\sum_{d=1}^{D} \sum_{h=1}^{H} \lambda^{(D-d)} (\alpha_h + \beta_{h,1} p^1(d) + \cdots + \beta_{h,H} p^H(d) \\ & - y_h(d))^2 \\ \text{subject to } & (20), (21), \text{ and } (22). \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ is the forgetting factor which exponentially discounts the influence of old data and therefore the model will catch up the behavior change of customers with time. (23) is a quadratic programming problem and can be solved using existing solvers.

6. Pricing Optimization for the Retailer

From this section, we restart using the subscript n in all of the following mathematical representations, which has been omitted in Section 4.

We define a cost function $C_h(L_h)$ to represent the retailer's cost of providing L_h electricity to all customers at each hour $h \in \mathcal{H}$. We make the same assumption as [4] that the cost function $C_h(L_h)$ is convex increasing in L_h, which is designed as follows.

$$C_h(L_h) = a_h L_h^2 + b_h L_h + c_h \tag{24}$$

where $a_h > 0$ and $b_h \geq 0, c_h \geq 0$ for each hour $h \in \mathcal{H}$.

We denote the minimum price (e.g., the wholesale price) that the retailer can offer as p_h^{min} and the maximum price (e.g., the retail price cap due to retail market competition and regulation) as p_h^{max}. As a result, we have:

$$p_h^{min} \leq p^h \leq p_h^{max}. \tag{25}$$

A maximum energy supply at each time slot, denoted as $E_h^{\max}$, is imposed on the retailer to respect the power network capacity. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_h = \sum_{n\in\mathcal{N}_1}\sum_{a\in A_n} x_{n,a}^h + \sum_{n\in\mathcal{N}_2}\Big(\sum_{s\in S_n}\overline{y_{n,s,h}} + \sum_{c\in C_n}\overline{y_{n,c,h}}\Big) \\ +\hat{R}_h(p^1, p^2, ..., p^H) \leq E_h^{\max}, \forall h \in \mathcal{H} \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Due to the retail market regulation, we add the revenue constraint to ensure a sufficient number of low price periods and thus to improve the acceptability of retailer's pricing strategies. That is, there exists a total revenue cap, denoted as RE^{max}, for the retailer. Thus, we have the following constraint [2]:

$$\begin{aligned} RE = \sum_{h\in\mathcal{H}} p^h \times \sum_{n\in\mathcal{N}_1}\sum_{a\in A_n} x_{n,a}^h + \sum_{n\in\mathcal{N}_2}\Big(\sum_{s\in S_n} B_{n,s} + \sum_{c\in C_n} B_{n,c}\Big) \\ + \sum_{h\in\mathcal{H}} p^h \times \hat{R}_h(p^1, p^2, ..., p^H) \leq RE^{max} \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Finally, the profit maximization problem for the retailer to optimize the electricity prices for the next day is modelled as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{p^h} \left\{ RE - \sum_{h\in\mathcal{H}} C_h(E_h) \right\} \\ \text{subject to constraints (25), (26), and (27).} \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

[2] It should be highlighted that such a revenue cap is necessary for the pricing optimization. Since the electricity is the basic necessity in daily life and fundamentally less elastic, without such a revenue cap, a retailer could lift its profit significantly by increasing its prices aggressively. However, such a pricing strategy will anger customers and could lead to political consequences [28]. For such a reason, the revenue cap which basically is the total customers' bill cap is necessary to ensure the sensible pricing strategy for a retailer.

Algorithm 1 GA based pricing optimization algorithm to (28) executed by the retailer

1: Population Initialization, i.e. generating a population of PN chromosomes randomly; each chromosome represents a strategy (i.e., electricity prices over H) of the retailer.
2: **for** i=1 to PN **do**
3: The retailer announces strategy i to customers.
4: Receive the responsive demand from $n \in \mathcal{N}_1 \cup \mathcal{N}_2$ (i.e., Algorithm 2 and 3). In addition, the responsive demands from C-NONE are estimated based on the aggregated demand model proposed in Section 5.
5: Fitness evaluation and constraint handling [32] to satisfy constraints (25 - 27).
6: **end for**
7: A new generation of chromosomes are created by using deterministic tournament selection without replacement, uniform crossover and bit flip mutation [29] [30] [31].
8: Steps 2-7 are repeated until the stopping condition is reached.
9: The retailer announces final prices to all the customers.

7. GAs based Solution Algorithms to the above Two-level Model

As the proposed two-level pricing optimization problem consisting of the profit maximization for the retailer and integrated *optimization+ learning* based demand modelling for customers is non-convex, non-differentiable and discontinuous, it is intractable for conventional non-linear optimization methods. As a result, we adopt genetic algorithms (GAs) based solution methods to solve the problems for retailer and its customers in a distributed and coordinated manner.

In our proposed genetic algorithms, binary encoding and deterministic tournament selection without replacement is adopted [29]. For the crossover and mutation operations, we employ uniform crossover and bit flip mutation respectively [30] [31]. The constraints are handled by the approach proposed in [32]. Readers are referred to [10] for more details on our adopted GAs.

Finally, the GAs based distributed pricing optimization framework are given in Algorithm 1. Moreover, the optimal home energy management algorithm for C-HEMS is given in Algorithm 2. The appliance-level learning algorithms for C-SM is presented in Algorithm 3. For C-NONE, the retailer could directly use the established demand models presented in Section 5 to forecast customers'consumptions. It is worth mentioning that at the end of each day, the established demand models of C-SM and C-NONE will be updated based on the newly available prices and usages data of that day. At the end, the optimal dynamic prices are found for the retailer.

8. Simulation Results

In this section, we conduct simulations to evaluate the proposed pricing optimization model with different types of customers.

Algorithm 2 HEMS executed by each smart meter for C-HEMS

1: Receive the price signals from the retailer via smart meter.
2: The smart meter schedules energy consumption based on prices by solving optimization problems in Section 3.
3: The smart meter only sends back the aggregated hourly demand of the household to retailer via two-way communication infrastructure.

Algorithm 3 Appliance-level learning algorithms executed by each smart meter for C-SM

1: Receive the price signals from the retailer via smart meter.
2: The smart meter calculates the expected hourly energy consumption and daily bill payment of each appliance based on the learning models proposed in Section 4.
3: The smart meter sends back the aggregated hourly demand and daily bill information for the whole household to the retailer via the two-way communication infrastructure.

8.1. Simulation Set-up

We simulate a neighbourhood consisting of one retailer and three different types of customers (i.e., C-HEMS, C-SM, C-NONE) where the total number of customers is set to 100. It is assumed that each customer has 5 appliances: EV, dishwasher, washing machine, clothes dryer and air conditioner. Further, a fixed amount (0.05 kwh) of background consumption at each hour is considered for each household. The scheduling window is set from 8AM to 8AM (the next day). It is worth mentioning that customers are assumed to be homogeneous due to hardware constraints with the aim to simply the model implementation process. For details on how to implement a similar kind of model with heterogeneous customers, readers are referred to [11] [33].

The parameter settings for HEMS optimization models of C-HEMS are given in Tables 1 2 3. As for C-SM, the historical usage data used in appliance-level customer behavior learning for shiftable appliances are generated by tuning HEMS optimization models with waiting time costs [17] whereas the historical usage data for identifying the demand model of curtailable appliances are simulated based on Section 3.3. For C-NONE, the aggregated demand model is learned from history electricity price data and down-scaled energy consumption data (i.e., daily consumption of each household is scaled down to the same amount as C-HEMS and C-SM) between 1 January 2012 and 21 December 2012 of ISO New England [34]. For the retailer, parameters of GAs are set as Table 4.

8.2. Results and Analysis

We implement the proposed pricing optimization algorithms under each case study listed in Table 5 where the evolution processes of GAs are shown in Figure 2. The revenue, cost and profit of the retailer under different case studies are given in Table 6. It can be found that, if all customers are C-SM, the profit of retailer will be \$120.12 compared with that of \$92.12 under 100% C-NONE. In addition, the profit of retailer can be further increased to \$124.05 if all customers becomes C-HEMS. The above results show that, without increasing its revenue, the retailer can actually gain more profit with the installation of smart meters and HEMS in households, which indicates that the retailers are likely to have strong motivations to participate in and promote the proposed pricing based demand response programs.

Table 1: Parameters for each interruptible appliance

Appliance Name	E_a	H_a	$x_{n,a}^{rated}$
Dishwasher	1.8kwh	8PM-7AM	1kwh
PHEV	10kwh	7PM-7AM	2.5kwh

Table 2: Parameters for each non-interruptible appliance

Appliance Name	E_a	H_a	$x_{n,a}^{rated}$	L_a
Washing machine	2kwh	8AM-9PM	1kwh	2hrs
Clothes Dryer	3kwh	8PM-6AM	1.5kwh	2hrs

Table 3: Parameters for each curtailable appliance

Appliance Name	U_a^{min}	H_a	$\underline{u}_a^h$	$\overline{u}_a^h$
Air-conditioner	18kwh	12PM-12AM	1kwh	2kwh

Table 4: Parameter settings of GAs

Parameter Name	Symbol	Values
Chromosome Length	L_g	10
Population Size	PN	300
Mutation Probability	P_g	0.005
Terminate Generation	T_g	300

Table 5: Combinations of different types of customers for pricing optimization

Case study number	C-HEMS	C-SM	C-NONE
1	0	0	100
2	0	30	70
3	0	100	0
4	30	70	0
5	100	0	0
6	50	30	20

Table 6: Comparison of revenue, cost and profit of the retailer under different case studies

Case study number	Revenue (\$)	Cost (\$)	Profit (\$)
1	350	257.88	92.12
2	350	249.25	100.75
3	350	229.88	120.12
4	350	229.10	120.90
5	350	225.95	124.05
6	350	233.47	116.53



Figure 2: The evolution process of GAs with different penetration rates of smart meter and HEMS.



Figure 4: Electricity demand of customers under different case studies.



Figure 3: Optimal prices for different case studies.

Furthermore, the optimized electricity prices under several selected case studies are shown in Figure 3 where the corresponding energy consumption of customers are plotted in Figure 4. It can be found from Figures 3 4 that, compared with that of C-NONE, the demands of C-HEMS and SM are more responsive to prices, and are effectively shifted from peak-demand periods (higher prices) to off-peak demand periods (lower prices). In the case where 3 different types of customers co-exist, the resulted prices and demands exhibit a mixed and synthesized behaviour. For instance, the demand of a mixed pool of customers under Case 6 is still responsive to price signals but less sensitive than that of C-HEMS (Case 3). In other words, in a realistic scenario like Case 6, our proposed pricing optimization model can generate profitable electricity prices for the retailer and lead to a reasonable consumption behaviour for customers.

8.3. Emerging Scenarios with PV Generation and Energy Storage

In the following, we consider the availability of PV generation for all types of customers (e.g., C-HEMS, C-SM, C-NONE) and also battery energy storage for C-HEMS. The pricing optimization for the retailer under such emerging scenarios are investigated in this subsection.

Suppose that a forecast of PV generation is known as a prior at the beginning of each day. It is further assumed that PV generation will be firstly used by customers whereas any surplus will be sold back to the grid at same retailer price of that time. The PV generation data used in this simulation is adopted from [8]. Furthermore, the revenue cap imposed on the retailer is reduced accordingly from \$350 to \$270 due to the availability of PV generation and therefore the reduction of energy demand from the retailer. In addition, we assume that C-HEMS use energy storage for price arbitrage to minimize their energy cost. The energy storage model is adopted from [8] and we consider *perfect charging and discharging*, i.e., the charging/discharging efficiency factor is equal to 1. The battery capacity is considered as 10 kwh and the maximum amount of energy to be charged/discharged in each time period is constrained to 2 kwh. Furthermore, the initial and final state of charge (SOC) are set to 80% (i.e., 8 kwh in this simulation). Note that a full battery energy storage model considering self-discharging and degradation [35] is out of scope of this paper but is part of our future plan.

The impact of PV penetration on the retailer is investigated under case studies shown in Table 5, where the simulation results can be found in Table 7. Compared with those in Table 6, we can see that the retailer achieves similar profit levels (i.e., ratio of profit to revenue). The above finding indicates that the profit of retailer is not significantly influenced by the penetration of PV generation.

Additionally, we study the impact of battery energy storage on the retailer where customers are C-HEMS. We consider two

Table 8: Comparison of revenue, cost and profit of the retailer under C-HEMS with PV and energy storage

Scenario	Revenue ($)	Cost ($)	Profit ($)
C-HEMS with PV and storage (no selling back)	270	145.45	124.55
C-HEMS with PV and storage (selling back)	270	124.98	145.02

Table 7: Comparison of revenue, cost and profit of the retailer under different case studies with PV generation

Case study number	Revenue ($)	Cost ($)	Profit ($)
1	270	198.64	71.36
3	270	170.66	99.34
5	270	167.29	102.71
6	270	174.63	95.37



Figure 5: Storage operation and appliance consumption profile in one household without capability of selling back electricity.

scenarios for C-HEMS (i.e., with/without the capability of selling electricity back to the grid), where the profits of retailer are given in Table 8. The above results reveal two-fold findings: 1) the retailer can improve its profit with the energy storage penetration in households; 2) the retailer could gain even more profit if customers (C-HEMS) have the capability of selling electricity back to the grid. Furthermore, the optimized prices and corresponding storage operations and appliance consumption profiles in the above two scenarios are illustrated in Figures 5 and 6. It can be easily found out that the customers with capacity of selling back electricity often charge/discharge the battery at maximum rate in order to take full advantage of price arbitrage to minimize their energy bills.

9. Conclusion

In this paper, we study the dynamic pricing optimization problem in a realistic scenario consisting of one retailer and three different types of customers (C-NONE, C-SM, and C-HEMS). The interactions between retailer and customers are



Figure 6: Storage operation and appliance consumption profile in one household with capability of selling back electricity.

treated as a two-level decision-making framework. Firstly, we propose an integrated *optimization+ machine learning* based demand modelling framework for customers. Secondly, we propose a profit-maximization based dynamic pricing model for the retailer subject to realistic market constraints. Finally, GAs based distributed pricing optimization algorithms are proposed to tackle the above two-level decision making problems. Simulation results indicate that our proposed pricing optimization model and solution algorithms are feasible and effective.

Acknowledgements

This work was partly supported by the National Nature Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 71301133), Humanity and Social Science Youth Foundation of Ministry of Education, China (Grant No. 13YJC630033), and the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, UK (Grant No. EP/I031650/1).

References

References

[1] P. Siano, Demand response and smart grids – a survey, Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 30 (2014) 461–478.

[2] B. P. Esther, K. S. Kumar, A survey on residential demand side management architecture, approaches, optimization models and methods, Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 59 (2016) 342–351.

[3] A.-H. Mohsenian-Rad, A. Leon-Garcia, Optimal residential load control with price prediction in real-time electricity pricing environments, IEEE transactions on Smart Grid 1 (2) (2010) 120–133.

[4] A.-H. Mohsenian-Rad, V. W. Wong, J. Jatskevich, R. Schober, A. Leon-Garcia, Autonomous demand-side management based on game-theoretic energy consumption scheduling for the future smart grid, IEEE transactions on Smart Grid 1 (3) (2010) 320–331.

[5] C. O. Adika, L. Wang, Autonomous appliance scheduling for household energy management, IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid 5 (2) (2014) 673–682.

[6] Z. Wu, S. Zhou, J. Li, X.-P. Zhang, Real-time scheduling of residential appliances via conditional risk-at-value, IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid 5 (3) (2014) 1282–1291.

[7] N. G. Paterakis, O. Erdinc, A. G. Bakirtzis, J. P. Catalão, Optimal household appliances scheduling under day-ahead pricing and load-shaping demand response strategies, IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics 11 (6) (2015) 1509–1519.

[8] Y. Zhang, R. Wang, T. Zhang, Y. Liu, B. Guo, Model predictive control-based operation management for a residential microgrid with considering forecast uncertainties and demand response strategies, IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution 10 (10) (2016) 2367–2378.

[9] M. Zugno, J. M. Morales, P. Pinson, H. Madsen, A bilevel model for electricity retailers' participation in a demand response market environment, Energy Economics 36 (2013) 182–197.

[10] F.-L. Meng, X.-J. Zeng, A stackelberg game-theoretic approach to optimal real-time pricing for the smart grid, Soft Computing 17 (12) (2013) 2365–2380.

[11] L. P. Qian, Y. J. A. Zhang, J. Huang, Y. Wu, Demand response management via real-time electricity price control in smart grids, Selected Areas in Communications, IEEE Journal on 31 (7) (2013) 1268–1280.

[12] B. Chai, J. Chen, Z. Yang, Y. Zhang, Demand response management with multiple utility companies: A two-level game approach, IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid 5 (2) (2014) 722–731.

[13] W. Wei, F. Liu, S. Mei, Energy pricing and dispatch for smart grid retailers under demand response and market price uncertainty, IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid 6 (3) (2015) 1364–1374.

[14] M. Yu, S. H. Hong, A real-time demand-response algorithm for smart grids: A stackelberg game approach, IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid 7 (2) (2016) 879–888.

[15] M. Yu, S. H. Hong, Supply–demand balancing for power management in smart grid: A stackelberg game approach, Applied Energy 164 (2016) 702–710.

[16] J. Hosking, R. Natarajan, S. Ghosh, S. Subramanian, X. Zhang, Short-term forecasting of the daily load curve for residential electricity usage in the smart grid, Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry 29 (6) (2013) 604–620.

[17] F.-L. Meng, X.-J. Zeng, A profit maximization approach to demand response management with customers behavior learning in smart grid, IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid 7 (3) (2016) 1516–1529.

[18] G. W. Hart, Nonintrusive appliance load monitoring, Proceedings of the IEEE 80 (12) (1992) 1870–1891.

[19] Z. Yun, Z. Quan, S. Caixin, L. Shaolan, L. Yuming, S. Yang, Rbf neural network and anfis-based short-term load forecasting approach in real-time price environment, IEEE Transactions on power systems 23 (3) (2008) 853–858.

[20] H. Mao, X.-J. Zeng, G. Leng, Y.-J. Zhai, J. A. Keane, Short-term and midterm load forecasting using a bilevel optimization model, IEEE Transactions on Power Systems 24 (2) (2009) 1080–1090.

[21] A. Khotanzad, E. Zhou, H. Elragal, A neuro-fuzzy approach to short-term load forecasting in a price-sensitive environment, Power Systems, IEEE Transactions on 17 (4) (2002) 1273–1282.

[22] D. S. Kirschen, G. Strbac, P. Cumperayot, D. de Paiva Mendes, Factoring the elasticity of demand in electricity prices, IEEE Transactions on Power Systems 15 (2) (2000) 612–617.

[23] Q. Ma, X.-J. Zeng, Demand modelling in electricity market with day-ahead dynamic pricing, in: 2015 IEEE International Conference on Smart Grid Communications (SmartGridComm), IEEE, 2015, pp. 97–102.

[24] V. Gómez, M. Chertkov, S. Backhaus, H. J. Kappen, Learning price-elasticity of smart consumers in power distribution systems, in: Smart Grid Communications (SmartGridComm), 2012 IEEE Third International Conference on, IEEE, 2012, pp. 647–652.

[25] P. R. Thimmapuram, J. Kim, Consumers' price elasticity of demand modeling with economic effects on electricity markets using an agent-based model, Smart Grid, IEEE Transactions on 4 (1) (2013) 390–397.

[26] D. S. Kirschen, G. Strbac, Fundamentals of power system economics, John Wiley & Sons, 2004.

[27] H. Aalami, M. P. Moghaddam, G. Yousefi, Modeling and prioritizing demand response programs in power markets, Electric Power Systems Research 80 (4) (2010) 426–435.

[28] Ed miliband: Labour would freeze energy prices, `http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-24213366`, accessed: 2016-08-30.

[29] T. Blickle, L. Thiele, A comparison of selection schemes used in evolutionary algorithms, Evolutionary Computation 4 (4) (1996) 361–394.

[30] G. Syswerda, Uniform crossover in genetic algorithms, in: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Genetic Algorithms, 1989, pp. 2–9.

[31] P. Reed, B. Minsker, D. Goldberg, Designing a competent simple genetic algorithm for search and optimization, Water Resources Research 36 (12) (2000) 3757–3761.

[32] K. Deb, An efficient constraint handling method for genetic algorithms, Computer methods in applied mechanics and engineering 186 (2) (2000) 311–338.

[33] F.-L. Meng, X.-J. Zeng, A bilevel optimization approach to demand response management for the smart grid, in: Evolutionary Computation (CEC), 2016 IEEE Congress on, IEEE, 2016, pp. 287–294.

[34] ISONewEngland, Hourly zonal information, http://iso-ne.com/markets/hstdata/znl_info/hourly/index.html, accessed 1 March 2013 (December 2012).

[35] J. Vetter, P. Novák, M. Wagner, C. Veit, K.-C. Möller, J. Besenhard, M. Winter, M. Wohlfahrt-Mehrens, C. Vogler, A. Hammouche, Ageing mechanisms in lithium-ion batteries, Journal of power sources 147 (1) (2005) 269–281.